



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Travellers in Greece are apt to complain of the monotony of Easter lamb as an article of diet. I remember especially one dinner at Megalopolis, every course of which—and there were several—consisted of the Paschal *arnaki*; and mindful of that surfeit when the keeper of the khan at Diakophto, where I waited four mortal hours for my train to Patras, offered to slaughter for my mid-day meal one of the innocent creatures cropping the flowery food in the adjacent field, I declined the sacrifice. To the recent traveller through the Journal Greek syntax may well have taken the place of the Easter lamb, and my articles on Stahl must have seemed not unlike the three-course dinner at Megalopolis. And yet something must be done with the ever accumulating literature, and I am tempted to mention first as a bit of what I call organic work a dissertation by KARL REIK, *Der Optativ bei Polybios und Philo von Alexandria* (Berlin, Fock). Under this unalluring title Dr. REIK has given us an excellent object lesson in the vernacular and the artificial use of the optative, as shown by the difference between Polybios and Philo in this regard. Polybios, following the trend of his times, in which the mood was declining, rather underdoes the optative though he uses it idiomatically. Philo overdoes it as a *nouveau riche* might overdo caviare and pâté de foie gras (A. J. P. IV 428; XXIII 131).

In the IGF. XXIII, S. 165 ff., SCHLACHTER continues his interesting statistical studies in the tenses and moods and passes from Homer to Herodotos (cf. A. J. P. XXIX 243), but I have only room for a bare summary of his results. (1) The uniformity of the usage in the several books. (2) The relative increase of the impersonal moods as compared with Homer, notably the loss in subjunctives and optatives. (3) Whereas the aoristic forms dominate in Homer, the durative <paratatic> forms dominate by far in Herodotos except in the subjunctive <an exception easily accounted for by the large use of the aor. subj. in final sentences and in those temporal sentences in which antecedence is involved>. (4) Certain verbs occur prevalently in the imperfect, others prevalently in the aorist, only partially coincident with Homeric use. The love of the imperfect is somewhat more extensive, and decidedly more accentuated than that of the aorist. (5) When in narrative a result is evolved out of preceding actions

the imperfect of all verbs is preferred. This SCHLACHTER calls the 'Fazit-imperfect' <a revival or survival of Nägelsbach's 'nachhaltige Wirkung', which has come up again in Stahl's 'Imperfect of Propagation' (A. J. P. XXIX 394). 'Fazit', which means 'sum total', seems to be a peculiarly unlucky way of putting what might be called an 'outstanding account'>. (6) Herodotos' preference for 'cursive expression'—'cursive' answering to the old fashioned, unsatisfactory (A. J. P. XVI 144) 'durative'—does not come out alike in all the moods. Of the more rarely employed moods (subj., opt., imper.) it is strongest in the imperative. Of those that are much used (ind., inf., part.) it is most perceptible in the inf. (7) The morphological relations of the thematic aorist to the present seem to be the cause of their excess over the average number of the aorist infinitive. (8) The aorist participles (but not those of the thematic aorist) are more numerous than the corresponding indicatives, which is not true of the imperfect (durative) participle.

In view of statistics like these and those presented by Professor Miller's article, A. J. P. XVI (1895) 139-185, it is to be hoped that such generalizations, as 'The Greek is an aorist-loving language', will disappear from our textbooks. But such generalizations die hard. 'Each author has a stylistic syntax of his own' (A. J. P. XXIII 6), and though SCHLACHTER has done good service by giving us exact figures, Herodotos' love for the imperfect is no revelation. Long ago Cobet accused Herodotos of abusing the imperfect *ἰαορι* (A. J. P. XXIII 250), and the dictum roused rebellion in one admirer of Herodotos, who took pains in his syntax to show how admirably Herodotos used his tenses (XXIII 452); but now comes Wackernagel, now comes Thumb, and the use of the subjunctive after the past tenses in Herodotos is attributed to some local Ionic influence and not to the advance of the sophistic spirit. The two passive futures are accounted for in the same way, and the difference between them—a favorite theme of late—is effaced (A. J. P. XXIX 391; see Meltzer, IGF. XXII, Anzeiger, S. 26).

Mr. MOULTON's *Prolegomena to the Grammar of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark) has reached a third edition in a very short time. Such a success is unthinkable for a philological manual outside the special field of Biblical study. But it is a good sign for all that. Philology, once the handmaid of theology, first set up shop for itself under the firm name of Friedrich August Wolf & Co. It may have to go back to the old theological house from which it started. At all events every one will recognize the importance of the new lines of grammatical study that

have been opened by Mr. MOULTON's fuglemen. In 1893 I wrote, in 1902 I printed, my musings on what I then dared to call the decline of the Greek language (A. J. P. XXIII 258). "We say to ourselves 'Chaos and Old Night. There are no problems of Greek syntax possible. We are in the realm of Solecism'. But that is not true. Language remains organic. The laws of the death are the laws of the life. Deorganization is unravelling and the unweaving teaches us the weaving". Against expressions like these, scholars like Mr. MOULTON would rebel. There is no deorganization. There is nothing but growth. The New Greek Thesaurus is to take in all the Greek that can be proved from the earliest times to the latest, and we are not to look upon the modern language as we are apt to look upon the serviceable rugs that are made out of worn-out carpets. Every now and then Mr. MOULTON chides me for my false view of the relations that the older language bears to its lineal successor, but faithful are the wounds of a friend, and his attitude on the whole is amicable. But a commentary on Mr. MOULTON's *Prolegomena* would carry me back to the *malebolge* out of which I have just emerged and I will forbear. Of course, I am quite in sympathy with Mr. MOULTON's efforts to make his grammatical studies readable (A. J. P. XXIII 2), and I congratulate him on the pleasure he has derived from his success, in which I rejoice as much as he does. It is sheer delight for a dweller in the frigid zone of grammar to have such good company in the use of tropical language and to consort with a man who unblushingly writes of an unblushing aorist (p. 133). Indeed he is bolder than I am, for I sedulously avoid tropes and figures in my textbooks. But there is always a something, always a somebody, and some Snarley-yow of a British critic, whose habitat I cannot recall, discussing Mr. MOULTON of late, said in substance: 'It seems that the Grammar of the New Testament is yet to be written. Let us hope that when it is written, it will be written in English and not in Journalese'.

An admirer and follower of the Germans, Mr. MOULTON has adopted many of the German technical terms. In his heart of hearts he prefers 'summary', but he submits to 'constative', and he is actually fond of 'ingressive' and 'punctiliar' (*punktuell*), both of which Stahl rejects (A. J. P. XXIX 398, 399). Unfortunately the Germans themselves are at odds about the nomenclature of the *Aktionsart*, the kind of time. The latest cry of anguish proceeds from that eminent scholar STREITBERG (IGF. XXII, Anzeiger, S. 72: *Die Benennung der Aktionsarten*), and I cannot help wishing that Mr. MOULTON, who has deigned to accept some of my things, had accepted my threefold remedy 'paratatic', 'apobatic' and 'syntelic' (A. J. P. XXIII 106), for with his help and the help of

Biblical scholars I might have relieved the situation. But though Mr. MOULTON is an admiring disciple of the Germans, he is insular enough to be interesting. So he devotes pages to Miss Purdie, he quotes Mr. Giles (p. 249) for something that was staring at him in Goodwin (M. T., R. E., p. 391), and he sets down the rediscovery of Gottfried Hermann's desist-formula for μή with pres. imper. to the credit of the late WALTER HEADLAM (p. 122) that πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερὸν χρῆμα, whose 'Greek verses' in the judgment of WILAMOWITZ, 'if they had been discovered in a Greek papyrus would immediately have been recognized as true Greek poetry' (SANDYS, *History of Classical Scholarship* III 485). But HEADLAM was a better poet than grammarian (A. J. P. XXVII 111), and we poor grammatical Ions—mere sacristans we—have to guard our sanctuary from these winged things even if they are swans. οὐκ ἄλλα φοινικοφαῖ πόδα κινήσεις; It will at all events be news to some of us oldsters that Hermann's formula needed rediscovering. And after all it is only half a truth; and in 1877 I gave in my Justin Martyr, Apol. I 15 what I still think to be the whole truth (S. C. G. 415), handed down doubtless by some of my German teachers. "μή with pres. imper. denotes a negative course of action, 'keep from' or the negative of a course of action, 'cease to'". 'Chi l'ha detto' is often a bootless inquiry (A. J. P. XXIII 5).

There is much more behind that must await the coming of a number of the Journal not so overloaded with syntax as is this. The study of the 'Parademarsch' of language as Mauthner calls it (A. J. P. XXVIII 356) may be overdone and even a syntactician may prefer to leave procession and processionists for a while and play in the shade with the Amaryllis of etymology or with the tangles of Neaera's hair, which may be supposed to represent the intertwinements of semantics. As for the outsiders, the very men who would resent being classed with those who call 'divine philosophy' 'harsh and crabbed' never fail to have their fling not only at syntax but at all manner of grammatical study, which is after all a branch of that same divine philosophy. And the missiles are always at hand just as in Aristophanes 'stones' are normally 'the stones', the stones that lay loose in the streets of Athens. This being the case I am not surprised that a *frondeur* like Dr. OSLER can hardly forgive the hero of his latest biography *Thomas Linacre* for being a grammarian, even though Julius Caesar and Milton were grammarians.

'Fed to inanition', says Dr. OSLER, 'on the dry husks of grammar and with bitter schoolboy memories of Farrar on the

Greek verb, I can never pick up a textbook on the subject without regret that the quickening spirit of Greece and Rome should have been for generations killed by the letter with which alone these works are concerned'. And then Dr. OSLER proceeds to quote Gomperz on Pindar's ignorance of technical grammar and to defile the grave of Protagoras who is supposed to have started the devilry, the same Protagoras, by the way, to whom the same Gomperz attributes a famous tract in the Hippocratean corpus (A. J. P. XI 529), the same Protagoras who was himself a manner of doctor (A. J. P., l. c.). Galen, if not a grammarian in the modern sense, was a grammarian in the antique sense, or he could not have been the critic that he was. And if there is to be a suit of Physician vs. Grammarian there is something to be said in favor of the grammarian. Plato's subtle irony cannot be understood without a knowledge of the language that only grammatical analysis can reproduce (A. J. P. XXI 471; XXX 4), and to one grammarian, at least, it seems droll that Dr. OSLER who embodies all the winning sides of his profession should have selected the Eryximachos of the Symposium as the best type of the physician of old, Eryximachos, the pedantic system-monger of *plenum* and *vacuum*, who was only on sufferance in that brilliant company and whom Plato holds up to ridicule as incorporating the worst foibles of the professor of the healing art.

'Nowhere in literature', says Dr. OSLER in his *Counsels and Ideals* (p. 24), 'do we have such a charming picture illustrating the position of the cultivated physician in society as that given in Plato's Dialogues of Eryximachus, himself the son of a physician Acumenus. In that most brilliant age the physician was the companion and friend, and in intellectual intercourse the peer of the choicest spirits' <as he is today>. Now the position of the physician in Greek society is not a matter to be discussed in *Brief Mention*. But to my mind Eryximachos himself has never been the most attractive figure in the group of banqueters. The tipsy mockery of Alkibiades peeps out from under the cover of the conventional quotation *ἡτρὸς ἀνὴρ*, and if Eryximachos is allowed to take up his parable, it is because Plato wished to let his humour play on the weak sides of the profession as he has done elsewhere. In my analysis of the speeches in the Symposium printed many years ago in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, January, 1887, I paid my respects to Eryximachos. 'Eryximachos', I concluded, 'shows at once the dishonesty of the sophist and the dogmatism of his profession in trying to make good his pedantic correction of his predecessors and by his fine phrases works himself up to the belief in his own triumphant cleverness'. Charming figures there are among the Greek doctors from Cheiron down, but the son of Akumenos is not the peer of the son of Philippos, who follows him; and 'the

healthy humanity of Aristophanes swallows up in the broad *rictus* of the comic mask the sytem-mongery of Eryximachos'. In CESAREO'S *I due simposi* (A. J. P. XXIII 446 foll.) there is an interesting study of Eryximachos (p. 114), but unfortunately for my thesis, one of the commentators on the Symposium, whom he cites, identifies Eryximachos with Plato himself, as monstrous a theory in my eyes, as if Shakespeare had been supposed to identify himself with Malvolio. But the mention of the Symposium leads naturally to the next *Brief Mention*, as will be seen.

The ordinary mortal's views of love are not to be reduced to a system. Life is a jumble of sacred and profane love. The love that moves the stars is sometimes nearer to us in our hot youth than in what is supposed to be serene old age, when the love that is rekindled often recalls the shameless greybeards of the Casina, and justifies the saying of the poet of love: *Turpe senilis amor*. Theory is sadly upset by practice, but there is no escaping theory for all that, and the student of the Platonic Symposium will read and reread IVO BRUNS'S illuminating essay on *Attische Liebestheorien* in his *Vorträge u. Aufsätze* in which he sets forth the difference between the discourse of Sokrates in the Phaedrus and the speech of Sokrates in the Symposium. The advance is not the dramatic advance of Sokrates. It is the advance of Plato himself. First Phaedrus, then Symposium. Usener, it will be remembered, has made an eloquent plea for the old tradition of the youthful composition of the Phaedrus. But what if the order is reversed? And there are those who would reverse it. Impressionism is not to be trusted in matters of style. Old age may be jaunty and youth languid. The sober and measured pace of the young writer may change into the titubant jig of the old hack. I have been taught by experience profound distrust of all internal evidence, that is not, so to speak, historical. As a writer for the daily press I have had article after article of mine ascribed to the wrong man on the basis of an inimitable style. That is the reason why I have lent an ear to prosaic statisticians; and prosaic statisticians have shown that stylometric tests assign the Phaedrus to the later stage of Plato's authorship; and this result coincides with the contention of M. ROBIN in his *Théorie Platonicienne de l'Amour* (Paris, Félix Alcan). The theory of love, he declares, has too often been considered as an episode or an accessory of Platonic philosophy, and the object of his book is to show that it is most closely connected with that philosophy, and that it occupies a very important position in the Platonic system. In order to prove this, the author has studied in detail the delicate and complex problem of the comparative chronology of the Lysis, the Symposium, the Phaedo and the Phaedrus, and has been led to the conclusion that the Phaedrus is one of the

latest dialogues of Plato and contains the most elaborate exposition of the theory of love in its relation to the theory of ideas and the theory of the soul, and so serves to determine the nature and the function of Platonic love. M. ROBIN goes to work in the way recommended and exemplified by Bonitz, and more recently by Horn (A. J. P. XV 92), and his book begins with an analysis, which amounts often to a translation of the parts of the *Lysis*, the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus* in which Plato has developed his theory of love. I have followed very closely M. ROBIN's own summary of his book, which cannot be discussed here. 'The *Phaedrus*', says Professor SHOREY, in his *Unity of Plato's Thought* (p. 71), 'with its profusion of ideas, its rich technical and poetical vocabulary and its singular coincidences with the *Laws* and *Timaeus*, makes the impression of a mature work', and this impression M. ROBIN has undertaken to turn into conviction.

Shall we say 'gegenstandlos' (A. J. P. XXIX 499) or 'gegenstandslos'? I took the part of the analogists, and a proof-reader, to whom I owe much, took the part of the anomalists; and the discussion carried me back to my boyhood, when the quarrel about 'sigmatism' in German compounds was rife. But I am just now more interested in the meaning than in the form of the word, for I am ruefully contemplating a new doctoral dissertation in which a pupil of Professor CAPPS has attacked the old doctrine of the three actors, KELLEY REES, *The So-called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama* (Chicago University Press). Another of the many skiffs in which I intended to put out to sea has rotted in harbour like Winans' famous cigar-ship, and I have given another illustration of the danger of following the Horatian precept too closely. Not long before his lamented death in 1881, SIDNEY LANIER got up a course of lectures on Shakespeare in which I was to take part. The themes of my discourses were *Timon of Athens* and *Macbeth*. The *Macbeth* lecture was a comparison of the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus and the *Macbeth* of Shakespeare from the point of view of dramatic structure. It so happened that at the same time the same theme was engaging the attention of Professor RICHARD G. MOULTON on the other side of the water. The two studies were entirely independent of each other. MOULTON's work, as it appeared subsequently in his *Ancient Classical Drama* (1889, pp. 225 foll.), was constructive, mine destructive. My plan was to apply the limitations of the antique stage, as then understood, to the play of *Macbeth* and to show how the life of the piece would be killed by the conditions that obtained at the time of the *Agamemnon*. Needless to say, as a giant-queller I was a success. The play was as dead as the hero. The moral was 'The artistic justification of the chorus as the life-breath of a Greek play'. The narrow platform of the Greek stage, the law of the three actors, played havoc with *Macbeth*. But since those far-off days

the Aeschylean stage has become a circus, and now that 'the rule of three' has been relegated to the limbo of false traditions, my little essay is not worth rewriting. "Ganz gegenstandslos oder 'wenn das hübscher lautet' ganz gegenstandslos geworden".

SCHROEDER'S Teubner edition of Pindar might well call forth various comment, but just now I will limit myself to one remark, which is a confession. In the recently discovered fragments which he has incorporated in his volume he has retained the reading [Πίνδο]ν ἀν' εὐδομον (A. J. P. XXIX 121). This is a painful reminder of a sad inadvertence of my own. Instead of [Κρίσα]ν which I proposed for the passage I should have written [Κίρρα]ν. Kriśa and Kírra are poetically, if not topographically one, and κρίσα is the Homeric, not the Pindaric quantity. Still the position in the verse may have something to do with the quantity. Not to mention the well-worn ἄρες, ἄρες, I might cite the shift of the quantity of χρύσεος in Pindar himself, but a frank acknowledgment of what others might fairly call by a harsher name than that of inadvertence is the best course. I have known worse sins to take shelter behind the printer's devil.

The project of a new Greek Thesaurus to which allusion was made above (p. 107) is discussed in a long, important and interesting article of the *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Technik* by the eminent authority on Mediaeval and Modern Greek Philology, KARL KRUMBACHER. The international undertaking set on foot by the late Sir Richard Jebb has fallen through, and the Greek government has engaged in the work as a purely national enterprise. *The Historical Lexicon of the Greek Language from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* is to be an abiding monument of the immortality and unity of the Greek people: and the centennial of the Greek War of Liberation is to be celebrated by the publication of the first part March 25, 1921. The commission in charge is headed by Kontos, Hatzidakis and Menardos, names which inspire respect and confidence, and with the advance of philological studies in Greece there will be native helpers enough to make the work a national achievement in every sense. Unfortunately, the financial basis seems to be quite inadequate for a gigantic enterprise that is to take in two millennia and a half. The scheme of the British Academy drew the line at 600 A. D. The Greek scheme, which comes down to the present day, involves difficulties that increase, as KRUMBACHER says, in geometrical progression, the farther the philological pioneers advance from the classical time. There is no space in this number of the Journal for a summary of KRUMBACHER'S illuminating essay on the conditions of the vast enterprise. There is only room to express a hearty sympathy with him in his joy at the

great undertaking and his wish for a happy progress of the work, the consummation of which so many of those who love Greece and things Greek cannot hope to see.

G. L. H.: A year ago the *Nomina Sacra* of LUDWIG TRAUBE, which has called forth so much discussion, appeared posthumously as a volume of *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, a series due to his initiative (A. J. P. XXVIII 241). In this volume which had the advantage of a final revision from the author, the promise was held out by the editor that other material, almost ready for publication, would be forthcoming. This promise is fulfilled by the appearance of a large octavo volume *Zur Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde* (München, 1909. C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck) edited by PAUL LEHMANN, the first of five volumes of *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, to be published under the general editorship of FRANZ BOLL. This introductory volume begins with a biographical sketch of TRAUBE by BOLL; then follows a twelve page bibliography of his published work, and an equal number of pages devoted to a list of his manuscript remains, both due to LEHMANN. The mere titles of the second bibliography denote the breadth of interest, and wealth of detail found in the published work of TRAUBE, that mark him as the most profound student of medieval Latin literature in the last century; and the four contributions to paleography and history of manuscripts, given in this volume do not belie one's anticipations. The first (1-80) is the most complete record extant of the progress of the science of paleography down to the present day; the second (81-127) is devoted to the outer history of the *book* before the age of printing. It gives an account of the great collections of manuscripts of the past, and of the libraries in which they are preserved to-day; a sketch of libraries, ancient, medieval and modern; with an account of investigations in search of manuscripts "voyages littéraires", and of catalogues of manuscripts of former and extant collections. These two studies of TRAUBE, to which the editor only needed to add certain bibliographical indications, is an invaluable guide to these several related subjects, which have never before been brought under one head. The third study is a paper upon the principles and history of abbreviations, an introduction to *Nomina Sacra*, delivered before the Munich Academy in 1899, and the last hundred pages (157-263), a descriptive catalogue of the Latin manuscripts written in capitals and uncials, is by far the fullest treatment of the subject, has been compiled by LEHMANN, with the aid of TRAUBE'S material, and upon the lines laid down by him. With such a beginning, one can only urge on the early completion of such a valuable work as this series of volumes is sure to be.